



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,675	03/30/2001	Barbara A. Christensen	RA 5365 (33012/312/101)	9210
27516	7590	06/13/2006	EXAMINER	
UNISYS CORPORATION			HU, JINSONG	
MS 4773			ART UNIT	
PO BOX 64942			PAPER NUMBER	
ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942			2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/822,675

Applicant(s)

CHRISTENSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Jinsong Hu

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination. Claim 8 has been amended.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sears et al. (US 2002/0026507).
4. As per claims 1-3, Sears teaches the invention as claimed including a data processing system having a user terminal for accessing a selected one of plurality of applications coupled to a data base management system having a data base responsively coupled to said user terminal via a publicly accessible digital data communication network [Fig. 2], the system comprising a user interface module coupled to said user terminal via said publicly accessible digital data communication network [72, Fig. 2; pars. 75 & 77-78] and located within said data base of said data base

Art Unit: 2154

management system which communicates with said application via said data base management system [pars. 98-99].

5. As per claim 4, Sears teaches the selected one of said plurality of applications, said data base management system and said user interface module are resident within a single server [pars. 86, 92 & 94].

6. As per claims 6-9, since they are apparatus claims of claims 1-4, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-4 above.

7. As per claims 11-14, since they are method claims of claims 1-4, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-4 above.

8. As per claims 16-19, since they are means plus function claims of claims 1-4, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-4 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2154

10. Claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sears et al. (US 6,434, 619) as applied to claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-19 above, in view of Gebauer (US 6,446,117).

11. As per claims 1, 10, 15 and 20, Sears teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Sears does not specifically teach the data base management system is Classic MAPPER.

12. However, Gebauer on the other hand teaches a data base management system is Classic MAPPER. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Sears and Gebauer because utilizing Gebauer's classic MAPPER in Sears's system would improve the functionality by allowing user generating various reports [Gebauer, col. 2, lines 27-30]. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Sears's system with Gebauer's classic MAPPER to improve the functionality of the system.

### ***Conclusion***

13. Applicant's arguments filed on 3/27/06 for claims 1-20 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that

(1) Sears does not teach the user interface module located outside the user terminal;

(2) Sears does not teach the step of transferring, receiving, storing and retrieving;

(3) 103 (a) rejections for claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 are improper.

14. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's remarks:

A. As to point (1), applicant fails to consider the teaching of Sears's reference for providing functions of a server by a browser proxy client **95** [i.e., user interface module], which is located within server farm [i.e., database management system, pars. 88; Fig. 2]. Thus, Sears does teach the limitation in claim 1.

B. As to point (2), applicant fails to consider the teaching of Sears's reference for receiving the request from user, processing the request and then sending the requested content to the user [par. 103]. Thus, Sears does teach the limitation in the claim.

C. As to point (3), the combination of the both references are based on the knowledge of a person with ordinary skill in the art and implemented, thus the 103(a) rejection is proper.

Accordingly, Sears and Gebauer are still relevant prior art references.

15. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

16. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/822,675  
Art Unit: 2154

Page 7

Jinsong Hu

June 5, 2006



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100